UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/848,426	05/04/2001	Juhnyoung Lee	YOR9-2001-0251US1	7808

	7590	04/08/2004		EXAMINER

McGuireWoods, LLP
Suite 1800
1750 Tysons Boulevard
Tysons Corner
McLean, VA 22102-3915

EXAMINER
LIU, JOSHUA C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2121	4

DATE MAILED: 04/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	**Applicant(s)**
Office Action Summary	09/848,426	LEE ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**
	Joshua C Liu	2121

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corresp ndence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>*04 May 2001*</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle,* 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>*1-18*</u> is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>*1-9,11-15,17 and 18*</u> is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) <u>*10 and 16*</u> is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-18 have been examined.

Specification

2.   The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of minor informalities.

> "The system and method uses rules..." on L. 4 should read "The system and
>
> method use rules..."

> "The system and method includes a data..." on L. 6 should read "The system and
>
> method include a data ..."

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Objections

3.   Claims 1-2, 4, 9-10, 16, and 18 are objected to because of the following

informalities:

> Claim 1 recites "RFQs" on L. 9, which is an abbreviation for "Request for
>
> Quotes". The Examiner suggests that the Applicant recite "Request for Quotes"
>
> as this is the first mention in the claims.

> Claim 2 recites "...the enterprise data sources include one or more of..." on L. 1,
>
> which is vague and recites to an open-ended group. The Examiner suggests that
>
> the Applicant recite "...the enterprise data sources include one or more data
>
> sources selected from the group consisting of..."

> Claim 4 recites "...about one or more of objects including..." on L. 1-2, which is
>
> vague and recites to an open-ended group. The Examiner suggests that the

Applicant recite "...about one or more of objects <u>selected from the group</u>

<u>consisting of</u>..."

> Claim 5 recites the set of actions" on L. 3, which has no antecedent basis.

> Claim 9 recites "...the attribute categories include..." on L. 1, which is vague and

recites to an open-ended group. The Examiner suggests that the Applicant recite

"...the attribute categories include <u>attributes selected from the group consisting</u>

<u>of</u>..."

> Claim 10 is objected to because it depends on rejected claim 1.

> Claim 16 is objected to because it depends on rejected claim 13.

> Claim 18 recites "A machine readable medium..." on L. 1, which may be non-

statutory. The Examiner suggests that the Applicant recite "A computer readable

medium..."

> Claim 18 is incomplete because Pg. 20 of the Application is missing. The

Examiner substitutes Claim 18 with the version in the published version of this

Application.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-6 and 11-15, and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Khedkar (US Patent Publication Number 2002/0147695; Filed

6/21/1999) in view of Baronwoski (US Patent Number 5,926,800; Issued 7/20/1999).

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites

A computer system for ranking one or more objects having two or more attributes, comprising:
    (a) a data aggregator that integrates data from two or more enterprise data sources into an aggregated enterprise database;
    (b) a knowledge base generator that constructs a knowledge base by extracting at least one of facts and rules from the aggregated enterprise database and stores the facts and rules in a knowledge base database; and
    (c) a bid configurator that constructs one or more sell bid candidates for one or more target RFQs by using at least one inference engine and the extracted facts and rules from the knowledge base database.

> Regarding claim 1, Khedkar discloses (b) a knowledge base generator that uses

a neural network to calculate a property value from a set of inputs that (c)

constructs one or more property value estimates by using at least one inference

engine and the extracted facts and rules from the knowledge base database

(Khedkar Fig. 1-4; ¶7; ¶14-26; ¶32-33; ¶36). However, Khedkar does not teach

providing a data aggregator that integrates data from two or more enterprise data

sources. Baronowoski teaches providing (a) a data aggregator that integrates

data from two or more enterprise data sources (Baronowoski Fig. 1; Col 5 L. 7-

31, "The system... line of credit.") –in order to accommodate and account for

different sources of data (Baronowoski Col 3 L. 41-59, "These and other... the

policyholder."). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art to modify Khedkar in view of Baronowski by providing a data aggregator

that integrates data from two or more enterprise data sources.

Claim 2

> Regarding claim 2, see §103 rejection for claim 1, *supra*, and (Baronowoski Fig. 1; Col 5 L. 7-31, "The system... line of credit.") –in order to accommodate and account for different sources of data (Baronowoski Col 3 L. 41-59, "These and other... the policyholder.").

Claim 3

> Regarding claim 3, see §103 rejection for claim 1, *supra*, and (Khedkar Fig. 2; ¶14-19).

Claim 4

> Regarding claim 4, see §103 rejection for claim 1, *supra*, and (Baronowoski Fig. 1; Col 5 L. 7-31, "The system... line of credit.") –in order to accommodate and account for different sources of data (Baronowoski Col 3 L. 41-59, "These and other... the policyholder.").

Claim 5

> Regarding claim 5, see §103 rejection for claim 1, *supra*, and (Khedkar Fig. 2-4; ¶7; ¶14-26; ¶32-33; ¶36).

Claim 6

> Regarding claim 6, see §103 rejection for claim 3, *supra*, and (Khedkar Fig. 2; ¶14-19).

Claim 11

> Regarding claim 11, see §103 rejection for claim 1, *supra*, and (Khedkar ¶30-36).

Claim 12

> ➤ Regarding claim 12, see §103 rejection for claim 1, *supra*, and (Khedkar ¶33-35).

Claim 13

Claim 13 recites

A method of configuring one or more sell bids, comprising the steps of:
(a) aggregating data from one or more enterprise data sources;
(b) storing the aggregated enterprise data in an integrated database system;
(c) extracting one or more facts useful for bid configuration from the integrated database system;
(c)
(d) deriving one or more rules useful for bid configuration from the integrated database system;
(e) constructing one or more knowledge base systems by storing the facts and rules in a form understood by one or more inference engines; and
(f) constructing one or more sell bid candidates for one or more target RFQs by running one or more facts and rules from the target RFQs and the knowledge base system to the one or more inference engines.

> ➤ Regarding claim 13, Khedkar discloses a method of configuring property value
>
> estimation, comprising the steps of (c) extracting useful facts, (d) deriving useful
>
> rules, (e) constructing knowledge base systems, and (f) constructing property
>
> value estimations (Khedkar Fig. 1-4; ¶7; ¶14-26; ¶32-33; ¶36). However,
>
> Khedkar does not teach aggregating data from one or more enterprise data
>
> sources and storing the aggregated data. Baronowoski teaches (a) aggregating
>
> data from one or more enterprise data sources and (b) storing the aggregated
>
> data (Baronowoski Fig. 1; Col 5 L. 7-31, "The system... line of credit.") –in order
>
> to accommodate and account for different sources of data (Baronowoski Col 3 L.
>
> 41-59, "These and other... the policyholder."). Therefore, it would have been
>
> obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Khedkar in view of Baronowski
>
> by aggregating data from one or more enterprise data sources and storing the
>
> aggregated data.

Claim 14

> Regarding claim 14, see §103 rejection for claim 13, *supra*, and (Khedkar ¶¶33-

35).

Claim 15

> Regarding claim 15, see §103 rejection for claim 13, *supra*, and (Khedkar Fig. 2;

¶¶14-19).

Claim 17

> Regarding claim 17, see §103 rejection for claim 1, *supra*, and (Khedkar ¶¶30-36).

Claim 18

Claim 18 recites

A machine readable medium containing code for configuring one or more sell bids, the code
implementing the steps of:
(a) aggregating data from one or more enterprise data sources;
(b) storing the aggregated enterprise data in an integrated database system;
(c) extracting one or more facts useful for bid configuration from the integrated database system;
(c)
(d) deriving one or more rules useful for bid configuration from the integrated database system;
(e) constructing one or more knowledge base systems by storing the facts and rules in a form
understood by one or more inference engines; and
(f) constructing one or more sell bid candidates for one or more target RFQs by running one or
more facts and rules from the target RFQs and the knowledge base system to the one or more inference
engines.

> Regarding claim 18, Khedkar discloses a computer-readable medium (Khedkar

Fig. 4; ¶7) containing code for configuring property value estimation, comprising

the steps of (c) extracting useful facts, (d) deriving useful rules, (e) constructing

knowledge base systems, and (f) constructing property value estimations

(Khedkar Fig. 1-4; ¶7; ¶¶14-26; ¶¶32-33; ¶36). However, Khedkar does not teach

aggregating data from one or more enterprise data sources and storing the

aggregated data. Baronowoski teaches (a) aggregating data from one or more

enterprise data sources and (b) storing the aggregated data (Baronowoski Fig. 1;

Col 5 L. 7-31, "The system... line of credit.") –in order to accommodate and

account for different sources of data (Baronowoski Col 3 L. 41-59, "These and

other... the policyholder."). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to modify Khedkar in view of Baronowski by aggregating

data from one or more enterprise data sources and storing the aggregated data.

6.   Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Khedkar (US Patent Publication Number 2002/0147695; Filed 6/21/1999) in view of

Baronwoski (US Patent Number 5,926,800; Issued 7/20/1999) and further in view of

Background Description.

Claim 7

Claim 7 recites "The system of 1, wherein (d) the one or more sell bid candidates

comprise one or more attribute name and value pairs, each of which belongs to one or

more attribute categories."

> Regarding claim 7, Khedkar discloses (b) a knowledge base generator that uses
> a neural network to calculate a property value from a set of inputs that (c)
> constructs one or more property value estimates by using at least one inference
> engine and the extracted facts and rules from the knowledge base database
> (Khedkar Fig. 1-4; ¶7; ¶14-26; ¶32-33; ¶36). However, Khedkar does not teach
> providing a data aggregator that integrates data from two or more enterprise data
> sources. Baronowoski teaches providing (a) a data aggregator that integrates
> data from two or more enterprise data sources (Baronowoski Fig. 1; Col 5 L. 7-
> 31, "The system... line of credit.") –in order to accommodate and account for

different sources of data (Baronowoski Col 3 L. 41-59, "These and other... the policyholder.").

However, Khedkar in view of Baronowoski does not teach that the one or more sell bid candidates comprise one or more attribute name and value pairs, each of which belongs to one or more attribute categories. Background Description of this Application teaches that (d) the one or more sell bid candidates comprise one or more attribute name and value pairs, each of which belongs to one or more attribute categories. (Background Description Pg. 2 L. 18-22) –in order to allow the sellers to match exactly the buyers' requirements (Background Description Pg. 2 L. 24-25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Khedkar, in view of Baronowski, and further in view of Background Description, by having the one or more sell bid candidates comprise one or more attribute name and value pairs, each of which belongs to one or more attribute categories.

Claim 8

Claim 8 recites "The system of 1, wherein (d) the RFQs comprise one or more attribute name and value range pairs, each of which belongs to one or more attribute categories."

➢ Regarding claim 8, Khedkar discloses (b) a knowledge base generator that uses a neural network to calculate a property value from a set of inputs that (c) constructs one or more property value estimates by using at least one inference engine and the extracted facts and rules from the knowledge base database

(Khedkar Fig. 1-4; ¶7; ¶14-26; ¶32-33; ¶36). However, Khedkar does not teach providing a data aggregator that integrates data from two or more enterprise data sources. Baronowoski teaches providing (a) a data aggregator that integrates data from two or more enterprise data sources (Baronowoski Fig. 1; Col 5 L. 7-31, "The system... line of credit.") –in order to accommodate and account for different sources of data (Baronowoski Col 3 L. 41-59, "These and other... the policyholder.").

However, Khedkar in view of Baronowoski does not teach that the RFQs comprise one or more attribute name and value range pairs, each of which belongs to one or more attribute categories. Background Description of this Application teaches that (d) the RFQs comprise one or more attribute name and value range pairs, each of which belongs to one or more attribute categories. (Background Description Pg. 2 L. 18-22) –in order to allow the sellers to match exactly the buyers' requirements (Background Description Pg. 2 L. 24-25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Khedkar, in view of Baronowski, and further in view of Background Description, by having the RFQs comprise one or more attribute name and value range pairs, each of which belongs to one or more attribute categories.

Claim 9

➢ Regarding claim 9, see §103 rejection for claim 7, *supra*.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Joshua C Liu whose telephone number is (703) 305-

6435. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:30am-5:15pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Anil Khatri, can be reached on (703) 305-0282. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-

3900.

jl

Wilbert L. Starks, Jr.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit - 2121